

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-36 are pending in the application, with 1, 23, 35, and 36 being the independent claims. New claims 33-36 are sought to be added. Claims 1, 19, 23, and 32 are sought to be amended. Support for these changes can be found, inter alia, at Paragraphs 0031, 0032, 0040, 0041, 0043, and 0045 in the specification, and in Figures 1a-5 of the Drawings. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1-32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly being unpatentable over a combination of the following documents:

- a. U.S. Patent 6,221,375 to Howse (herein referred to as "Howse")
- b. U.S. Patent 4,923,199 to Yamamoto *et al.* (herein referred to as "Yamamoto"); and
- c. U.S. Patent 5,247,933 to Callahan *et al.* (herein referred to as "Callahan '933"); and
- d. U.S. Patent 5,528,049 to Callahan (herein referred to as "Callahan '049"). (Paper No. 9, pages 2-5).

Although Applicant respectfully disagrees, Applicant believes the above amendment has rendered these rejections moot and/or invalid. Applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 23 to emphasize features not taught or suggested by the above documents, taken separately or together. New claims 33-36 also recite features not taught or suggested by the above documents.

For example, regarding independent claims 1 and 23, the above documents do not teach or suggest “an adhesive composition mixed with [a] paramagnetic medium.” Regarding the newly added independent claims 35 and 36, the above documents do not teach or suggest, for example:

a paramagnetic medium coupled to a molecular control system, wherein said diamagnetic base separates a first portion of the perimeter of said paramagnetic medium from free space, and said diamagnetic base provides no separation between a second portion of the perimeter of said paramagnetic medium and free space, wherein said paramagnetic medium is operative to amplify or direct the electromagnetic emissions from said molecular control system into free space.

In Howse, the alleged “diamagnetic material” surrounds the alleged “paramagnetic core” to produce the composite particles of Howse’s invention. No portion of the “core” is not surrounded by the “coating.” (See Howse, Col. 2, lines 30-35 and 47-52). Additionally, there is no mention of an adhesive composition.

Yamamoto fails to cure the defects of Howse since Yamamoto also does not teach or suggest a “diamagnetic base [providing] no separation between a...portion of the perimeter of [a] paramagnetic medium and free space” or “an adhesive composition mixed with [a] paramagnetic medium.” Likewise, Callahan ‘933 and/or Callahan ‘049 fail to teach or suggest Applicant’s invention.

Furthermore if the Examiner continues to apply the above documents to reject independent claims 1 and 24, Applicant respectfully request the Examiner to clearly show where the recited features of Applicant's dependent claims are suggested by these documents. For example, the above documents do not suggest "leather or plant fibers" are recited in claim 6, "dielectric spines" as recited in claims 21 and 32, "sticky paper" as recited in claim 22, or a "diamagnetic tube extending outward from a diamagnetic base" as recited in claim 19. In light of the above, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of these claims, and allowance thereof.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicant believes that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to be "K. Patterson", written over a horizontal line.

Kendrick P. Patterson
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 45,321

Date: Nov. 1, 2004

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600

289879_1.DOC